IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE MIDDLE DISTRICT OF TENNESSEE AT NASHVILLE

| DELANEY ESPER et al. |) | |
|----------------------|-------|-------------------------|
| |) | Case No. 3:23-cv-00116 |
| V. |) | Judge Richardson |
| |) | Magistrate Judge Holems |
| RICHARD ENLOW et al. |) | |
| | ORDER | |

On September 15, 2023, Plaintiffs filed a motion for leave to amend their complaint (Docket No. 46), which was summarily denied as noncompliant with Local Rules 7.01 and 15.01. *See* Order at Docket No. 47.) Now, Plaintiffs have an amended motion for leave to amend their complaint (Docket No. 49), which includes the certification of conference with opposing counsel required by Local Rules 7.01(a)(1) and 15.01(a)(2) but was not accompanied by a supporting memorandum of law. Because the motion is contested and will therefore require the resolution of one or more issues of law, the filing of a supporting memorandum of law is required by Local Rule 7.01(a)(2).

By no later than **October 6, 2023**, Plaintiffs must file a memorandum of law in support of their motion for leave to amend that complies with Local Rule 7.01(a)(2). Plaintiffs and their counsel are cautioned that further failure to comply with the Court's local rules or orders of the Court will become increasingly consequential. *See* Fed. R. Civ. P. 16(f).

The 14-day time for responses to Plaintiffs' amended motion for leave to amend their complaint (Docket No. 49) under Local Rule 7.01(a)(3) will begin to run from the date on which Plaintiffs file their supporting memorandum of law.

It is SO ORDERED.

ARBARA D. HOLMES
United States Magistrate Judge

tothes